


Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-09)

Approved for use through 07/31/2012. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		J1036.0016/P016	
	Application Number	Filed	
	10/583,331-Conf. #5103	February 6, 2004	
	First Named Inventor Vittorio Orlandi et al.		
	Art Unit	Examiner	
	2854	J. E. Culler	
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant /inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 31,063</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34.</p> <p> Signature</p> <p>Stephen A. Soffen Typed or printed name</p> <p>(202) 420-4879 Telephone number</p> <p>October 6, 2011 Date</p> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> *Total of 1 forms are submitted.</p>			

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Vittorio Orlandi et al.

Application No.: 10/583,331

Confirmation No.: 5103

Filed: February 6, 2004

Art Unit: 2854

For: PROCESS AND EQUIPMENT FOR PRINTING
ON NON-WOVEN-FABRIC

Examiner: J. E. Culler

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants respectfully request a review of the legal and factual bases for the rejections in the above-identified patent application. Pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the Official Gazette Notice of July 12, 2005 for the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Program, favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In the Office Action dated 7/7/2011, all of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 19-22, 28, and 31-33 were rejected over U.S. Pat. No. 6,688,222 ("Cattanzuza") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,298,779 ("Gotanda") and U.S. Pat. No. 4,922,337 ("Hunt"), claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, 15-16, 24-26, and 34 were rejected over Cattanzuza, Gotanda, and Hunt in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,427,586 ("Takahashi"), claims 10-14 and 27 were rejected over Cattanzuza in view of Gotanda, Hunt, and U.S. Pat. No. 5,881,440 ("Deeming"), claims 17 and 30 were rejected over Cattanzuza in view of Gotanda, Hunt, Takahashi, and U.S. Pat. No. 5,312,500 ("Kurihara"), and claim 29 was rejected over Cattanzuza in view of Gotanda, Hunt, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,024,018 ("Darel").

Claim 1 features “[e]quipment for printing on non-woven fabric, comprising a support driven such as to transport a sheet of non-woven fabric, at least one driven printing body in order to carry out the printing, a control and command unit [and] an image control device operatively connected to said control and command unit [such that the] image acquiring device [is] constantly monitoring said non-woven fabric in order to detect the presence of creases or variations in the printing with respect to a preset standard, ... [and] if any differences are detected, said control and command unit sends electrical signals to said support and at least one printing body in order to modify their respective angular speeds and torque moments to correct the differences.” The cited references do not teach or suggest that an image acquiring device can detect creases or variations, and cause the command unit to alter the speed or torque moments of printing to correct the differences.

The Examiner asserts that Hunt teaches an image acquiring device that monitors the fabric. However, Hunt’s image acquiring device does not cause any alterations to the printing in order to correct variations. Instead, Hunt merely detects defects or other characteristics of the fabric and “denotes their locations.” Hunt, col. 4, lins 16-18. As such, none of the prior art teaches or suggests that differences between the actual printing and a preset standard can be corrected in the manner set forth by the claimed equipment.

The Examiner attempts to make up for the deficiency in Hunt by asserting that Gotanda teaches a control and command unit that receives signals from a printing apparatus and returns signals to modify the angular speeds and torque moments. However, the cited section of Gotanda teaches only varying the speed of the ink transferring and water transferring rollers. See Gotanda, col. 4, lines 41-65. Gordanda does not teach that the torque moment can be controlled.

Further, Gordanda does not teach that the speed and torque moment of a support and printing body, which transports the non-woven fabric and carries out the printing, can or should be altered. Instead, Gordanda teaches changing the speed of ink transferring roller 64 and water transferring roller 67. See Gordanda, col. 4, lines 41-65. The ink and water transferring rollers do not contact or transport the fabric W, so they cannot be the support and printing body of the claim.


See Figure 5. Even if the references could be properly combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner (which they can not), only the speed of the ink or water transferring rollers would be altered. The combination would not alter the speed and torque moment of the support or of the printing body, as claimed.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 19-22, 28, and 31-33 depend on claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Moreover, while the Examiner cites Takahashi, Deeming, Kurihara, and Darel to support rejections of other dependent claims, none of those references make up for the deficiencies in Catanuzza, Gotanda, and Hunt. As such, the remaining claims, all of which depend on claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen A. Soffen

Registration No.: 31,063

Eric E. Silverman

Registration No.: 66,832

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant